STATE OF CALIFORNIA
BUDGET CHANGE Proposal - Cover Sheet
DF-46 (REV 08/15)

Fiscal Year	Business Unit	Department	Priority No.
2016-2017	BU_3930	Department of Pesticide Regulation	4

Budget Request Name	Program	Subprogram
3930-004-BCP-DP-2016-GB	3540_Pesticide Programs	3540082_Enforcement 3540010_Pesticide Registration 3540019_Human Health & Environmental Assessments

Budget Request Description
Pollinator Protection Risk Evaluation

Budget Request Summary
The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) requests two positions and $335,000 in DPR Funds ($308,000 ongoing) to address the increasing workload with pollinator protection issues. One position will reside in DPR's Pesticide Registration Branch to help evaluate and assess ecotoxicology studies and to establish new pollinator data requirements in collaboration with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The second position will reside in the Pesticide Enforcement Branch and will organize onsite field events for growers and beekeepers, develop the mandated California Managed Pollinator Protection Plan, conduct enforcement training, create and disseminate brochures and educational materials, evaluate rulemaking, and investigate pollinator/pesticide bee damage incidents and causes. This strengthened communication and collaboration between beekeepers, growers, and regulators will result in fewer pesticide bee damage incidents.

Requires Legislation	Code Section(s) to be Added/Amended/Repealed	
☐ Yes ☒ No		
Does this BCP contain information technology (IT) components? ☐ Yes ☒ No *If yes, departmental Chief Information Officer must sign.*	Department CIO	Date

For IT requests, specify the date a Special Project Report (SPR) or Feasibility Study Report (FSR) was approved by the Department of Technology, or previously by the Department of Finance.

☐ FSR ☐ SPR Project No. Date:

If proposal affects another department, does other department concur with proposal? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Attach comments of affected department, signed and dated by the department director or designee.

Prepared By	Date	Reviewed By	Date
[signature]	01.04.2016	[signature]	1-4-16
Department Director	**Date**	**Agency Secretary**	**Date**
Brian Leahy	01.05.2016	[signature]	1/6/16

Department of Finance Use Only

Additional Review: ☐ Capital Outlay ☐ ITCU ☐ FSCU ☐ OSAE ☐ CALSTARS ☐ Dept. of Technology

BCP Type: ☐ Policy ☐ Workload Budget per Government Code 13308.05

PPBA	Original Signed By: Ellen Moratti	Date submitted to the Legislature
		1/7/16

A. Budget Request Summary

The Department of Pesticide Regulation (DPR) requests two positions and $335,000 ($308,000 ongoing) to address the increasing workload with pollinator protection issues. One position will reside in DPR's Pesticide Registration Branch (PRB) to help evaluate and assess ecotoxicology studies and to establish new pollinator data requirements in collaboration with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), where needed. The second position will reside in the Pesticide Enforcement Branch (ENF) and will organize onsite field events for growers and beekeepers, develop the mandated California Managed Pollinator Protection Plan (MP3), conduct enforcement training, create and disseminate brochures and educational materials, evaluate rulemaking, and investigate pollinator/pesticide bee damage incidents and causes. This strengthened communication and collaboration between beekeepers, growers, and regulators will result in fewer pesticide bee damage incidents.

B. Background/History

DPR's mission is to protect human health and the environment by regulating pesticide sales and use and by fostering reduced-risk pest management. DPR's strict oversight begins with pesticide product evaluation, registration, and continues with enforcement. For several years, pollinator (bee) colony health has been declining nationwide and worldwide. One of the possible contributing factors is exposure to pesticides. Certain pesticides are known to be acutely toxic to bees and other pollinators.

Pesticide Registration

A pesticide must be registered with DPR before it can be used, possessed, or offered for sale in California. DPR is statutorily required to thoroughly evaluate the pesticide's toxic effects, its fate in the environment, its potential exposure to people and non-target organisms, the potential for environmental problems with new pesticide products prior to registration, and continuously evaluate registered pesticide products to identify potential adverse impacts to human or environmental health. One of the core functions of DPR is to ensure timely registration decisions while enhancing the protection of human health and the environment.

Data evaluation

DPR reviews toxicology and other studies from the registrant for adequacy and potential adverse effects. If scientists conclude there are potential adverse health effects, they study the pesticide's risk potential. Staff scientists with expertise in chemistry, microbiology, plant physiology, pest and disease prevention, fish and wildlife biology, or environmental fate review data to determine the effects of pesticides on target pests and non-targets.

In the last couple of years, U.S. EPA and DPR have added new data requirements to allow assessment of the chronic risk of pesticide exposure to pollinators (honey and native bees). Honeybees have been steadily declining over the past decade. In 2012, in collaboration with Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency (PMRA) and DPR, U.S. EPA employed a new pollinator risk assessment framework. The new framework relies on a tiered process. The lowest tier (Tier I - (laboratory studies)) now serves as a screening tool. Higher tiers (Tiers II (semi-field studies) and III (full field studies)) rely on characterization of risk based on measured exposure values and colony-level effects studies providing a more realistic assessment of exposure and effect. The risk assessment process focuses on the major routes of exposure, including contact exposure (e.g., from overspray or direct contact with the pesticide on the plant surface) and dietary exposure (e.g., from consumption of contaminated pollen or nectar). In the past few years, due to increases in the number and complexity of federal data requirements for new pesticide products and broadening interest in the topic of pesticides and pollinator protection the workload for staff in DPR's PRB has and will continue to increase significantly.

In addition to the data requirement and assessment process, U.S. EPA also instituted various regulations and label revisions to currently registered pesticide products in order to provide further protection for pollinators. Last year, when U.S. EPA required label changes to pesticide products containing any of four neonicotinoids, DPR staff were redirected to review the amendments to currently registered neonicotinoid labels. In 2016-2017, U.S. EPA plans to require revisions to the labels of liquid and dust formulation foliar

use insecticides that have been determined via testing to have high toxicity to bees (less than 11 micrograms per bee). Currently, DPR registers 3,000 pesticide products meeting this definition. PRB has one staff person to handle all applications for registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients. Despite DPR's attempt to redirect available resources to assist with the label revisions to pollinator labeling language required for currently registered pesticide products, DPR cannot efficiently and effectively address this and the evaluation of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients without new resources.

Pesticide Use Enforcement

Many crops, especially in California, are dependent on commercial managed bees for pollination of the crop. Those crops, and sometimes adjacent crops, require the use of pesticides to control unwanted pests. Recent increased plantings of crops dependent on managed pollinations (e.g., almonds) have increased the number of pollinator pesticide damage incidents.

Awareness of this problem has increased nationwide, and the President, in his 2014 memo "Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators,"[1] directed U.S. EPA to engage state agencies in developing state MP3s as a means of mitigating pesticide risks to bees and other managed pollinators. U.S. EPA is also issuing new enforceable label restrictions and encouraging states and tribes to conduct outreach to growers and beekeepers.

In California, pesticide use enforcement is conducted by the local county agricultural commissioner (CAC). DPR's ENF Branch oversees and trains the 50+ CACs as part of our federal delegation of pesticide regulatory authority. This includes investigating pollinator damage incidents. When bees are damaged as a result of pesticide use, investigation and documentation must be performed promptly to identify the responsible party. Conducting an investigation to determine if pollinator colonies have been affected by the misapplication of a pesticide is a complex activity. Investigating bee damage incidences requires state biologist inspectors to assist the county biologists in developing a sampling plan, collecting samples of bees, sampling plant materials to document pesticide exposure, and reviewing pesticide use reports for the site of incidence and surrounding areas (often extending out a half mile or more) to determine what pesticides have been used and on what crops and what stage of growth.

The ENF Branch recently organized and sponsored several collaborative educational field events between growers, beekeepers, and regulators, as well as created and disseminated brochures, leaflets, and other educational training materials to improve compliance and pollinator protection. Ensuring safe use of pesticides while ensuring pollinator protection has long been a difficult balance for both DPR and the CACs.

Over the decades, California adopted laws and regulations to mitigate the hazards of pesticides to managed pollinators, many of which are now outdated and have not kept up with current cropping patterns and evolving pesticide chemistries. In addition, the new U.S. EPA directive for a state plan and issuance of additional pesticide label use restrictions require revisions to these rules.

The following Workload Measures are listed in the charts below:

- Develop and conduct onsite collaborative educational field events between growers and beekeepers.
- Develop a state MP3, recently federally mandated.
- Develop and conduct investigative enforcement training for local CAC inspectors on new label use restrictions and regulations.
- Make presentations to growers, applicators, beekeepers, regulators, and landowners statewide.
- Create and disseminate pamphlets, brochures, leaflets, and online information.
- Identify pollinator bee/pesticide incidents and investigate cause.
- Develop rulemaking to align with President's directive on pollinator protection.

[1] Available at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/06/20/presidential-memorandum-creating-federal-strategy-promote-health-honey-b>

Resource History

(Dollars in thousands)

Program Budget	PY – 4	PY - 3	PY - 2	PY - 1	PY
Authorized Expenditures	55,186	59,569	60,052	59,628	63,541
Actual Expenditures	53,771	57,495	55,957	59,341	62,330
Revenues	74,300	74,601	77,485	81,630	86,280
Authorized Positions	398.8	398.8	409.7	387.8	387.8
Filled Positions	384.3	374.1	384.5	366.5	360.4
Vacancies	14.5	24.7	25.2	21.3	27.4

Workload History

Workload Measure	PY – 4	PY - 3	PY - 2	PY - 1	PY	CY
New active ingredient pesticide products received	44	41	33	39	56	11 (As of June 30th)
New active ingredient pesticide products completed	10	8	7	16	11	7 (As of June 30th)
Registered pesticide products requiring amended pollinator labeling language	0	0	0	0	300	0
Conduct onsite field events for growers and beekeepers (events)	0	0	0	1	6	3
Develop managed pollinator protection plan (MP3)	-	-	-	-	-	Draft plan
Conduct enforcement training on pollinator protection (courses)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Make presentations to stakeholders on pollinator protection (presentations)	0	0	0	2	4	3
Create and disseminate pamphlets, brochures, etc. (documents)	0	0	0	0	3	Website content
Investigate pollinator / pesticide incidents and causes (# of incidents)	Unknown	1+ Unknown	1+ Unknown	5+ Unknown	5+ Unknown	--
Develop rulemaking package to strengthen pollinator protection	0	0	0	0	0	0

C. State Level Considerations

This proposal is consistent with DPR's strategic plan goals numbers 1, 3, and 6:

#1: Assure California's environment is not adversely affected by pesticides and that all people are protected from unacceptable pesticide risk;
#3: Maintain and continuously improve strong and equitable compliance and enforcement programs to ensure people and the environment are not exposed to unacceptable pesticide risks; and,
#6: Promote an understanding and awareness of DPR programs, priorities, initiatives, and accomplishments through effective external communications, outreach, and public education.
Over the past six years, DPR has worked extensively with U.S. EPA and Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency to address pollinator protection issues. California is a key player in national and international pollinator protection efforts. California has a vested interest in pollinator protection because its agriculture is dependent on pollinators for crop production. In fact, California

crops feed not only the state, but also the nation and the world. In 2014, the value of California crops that required pollination totaled $15 billion.

D. Justification

Pesticide Registration

Currently, DPR's resources are inadequate to address the increased workload related to new data requirements for assessing and mitigating the effects of pesticides on the health of pollinators. In June 2014, due to the significant decline of pollinators over the last several decades, President Obama issued a Presidential Memorandum "Creating a Federal Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators." This Strategy outlined a comprehensive approach to reducing the impact of multiple stressors on pollinator health, including pests and pathogens, and exposure to pesticides. Critical components of the Strategy are to advance the science supporting regulatory decisions, as well as strategies for mitigation.

Given the breadth, severity, and persistence of pollinator losses, U.S. EPA developed finalized guidance on the conduct of exposure and effect studies used to characterize the potential risk of pesticides to bees. The federal data requirements for pollinators have become more robust and complex as U.S. EPA seeks to evaluate and mitigate pesticide exposure to pollinators. In particular, more studies are now required in order to assess the potential for acute and chronic toxicity to honeybees. By regulation[2], DPR adopts U.S. EPA's data requirements. Changes to their data requirements directly impact the workload of DPR's PRB. The increased data requirements are shown in Table 1. This data must now be evaluated for each new active ingredient pesticide product received as shown in the Program Workload History tab.

Table 1. History of Pollinator Data Requirements

Prior to 2013 - Honey Bee Test Types	Number of Studies Required
Honey Bee Acute Oral Toxicity Test with End Use Product	1 or more
Honey Bee Acute Contact Toxicity Test with End Use Product	1 or more
Honey Bee Acute Toxicity Test with Metabolite(s)	1 or more

After 2013 – New Honey Bee Test Types	Number of Studies Required
Larval Acute Toxicity Test	1
Larval Chronic Toxicity Test	1
10-Day Adult Bee Chronic Test	1
Pollen and Nectar Residue Tests	5 or more
Semi-field tests	3 or more
Full Field Test	1 or more

Prior to 2013, only three types of pollinator data were required. The establishment of new pollinator data requirements in 2013 and the tiered approach to assessing exposure and effects has more than quadrupled the number of toxicology studies requiring review by DPR's PRB. Evaluating pollinator data and determining mitigation is difficult and complex due to the challenges in characterizing exposure to species (migration, habitat variation) and reducing exposure in a diverse environment.
In addition, for the second time in the last three years, U.S. EPA has announced its intention to require registrants to amend the labels of a number of currently registered pesticide products that may have

[2] Title 3, California Code of Regulation section 6159 states, "The director finds that the data required by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) regulations governing pesticide registration, reregistration, and classification adopted in Title 40, Code of Federal Regulations pursuant to authority in the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act substantially meet the data requirements of section 12824 of the Food and Agricultural Code."

adverse effects to pollinators. Currently, DPR registers 3,000 pesticide products meeting the new amendment criteria. DPR expects this second phase of pollinator protection label amendments to be followed by future amendments to further enhance the protection of pollinators as the results of emerging science are assessed. PRB temporarily redirected staff to evaluate the first wave of amendments; however, further redirection of these staff to accommodate an even larger number of pesticide product labels is not feasible with the resources currently available.

As required by statute[3], DPR accepts all pesticide products containing new active ingredients concurrently with submission to the U.S. EPA for federal registration. Within DPR, PRB is responsible for the evaluation of submitted ecotoxicology studies and the assessment of risk to pollinators if the pesticide product is used in accordance with the pesticide product label. With current staffing levels, PRB is unable to complete a thorough evaluation of ecotoxicology data submitted to assess potential harm to pollinators from new and currently registered pesticide products or to conduct pollinator risk evaluations to assess possible effects to pollinators from chronic exposure. PRB also has insufficient resources to evaluate amendments to currently registered products containing new active ingredients. Currently, PRB has one staff person to handle all applications for registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients. PRB needs one additional staff person to handle the increasing workload of assessing risk to pollinators, keeping up with emerging science, and working cooperatively with U.S. EPA and Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency as they prepare pollinator risk assessments on neonicotinoids and new products containing new active ingredients. This staff person would not only "assess pollinator risk" on neonicotinoids and new products containing new active ingredients, but also currently registered pesticide products when concerns arise regarding chronic effects to pollinators. Specifically, resources will be used to:

- Evaluate pollinator ecotoxicology studies submitted to support the registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients and the continued registration of currently registered products.
- Establish new pollinator data requirements and protocol development where protocols do not currently exist, and communicate with pollinator affiliated experts from around the world.
- Conduct pollinator risk evaluations in accordance with the U.S. EPA's new risk assessment framework for new pesticide products containing new active ingredients and currently registered pesticide products, when appropriate.
- Evaluate and process amendments, required by U.S. EPA, to the labels of foliar use insecticides determined to be highly toxic to bees.
- Evaluate and process applications for registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients.

Pesticide Use Enforcement

In the past year, the ENF Branch has redirected staff resources to organize and conduct pollinator (bee) protection events and make presentations at grower group, apiary, and regulatory venues to share information on pollinator protection. This has been at the expense of other mandated pesticide use enforcement activities. Resources have had to be redirected from produce residue sampling and compliance enforcement of other human health and environmental pesticide use inspections and investigations. Current staffing is insufficient to handle the additional workload and there is a backlog of statutorily mandated pesticide use enforcement activities.

In addition, the ENF Branch will be responsible for developing a California MP3, a significant workload that includes the requirement for a measurement of success metric to fulfill the President's 2014 directive to create a state plan.
Public and regulatory outreach is needed to provide information about the pollinator protection issues, describe the national strategy, establish collaboration and communication between the different stakeholders, and gain compliance with pollinator protections measures.

[3] Food and Agricultural Code §12836.5 states, "The director shall accept applications for registration of pesticide products containing a new active ingredient concurrently with the application to the United States Environmental Protection Agency. The application for registration must include all data and information that meet the requirements of this chapter."

The EMF Branch needs additional resources to continue conducting the onsite collaborative field events such as those recently organized and sponsored throughout the state for growers, beekeepers, and regulators, as well as creating and disseminating brochures, leaflets, and other educational training materials. Pesticide exposure can be minimized if pesticide applicators and beekeepers communicate prior to pesticide applications to allow crop protection products to be used without unreasonable adverse effects to managed pollinators.

DPR will develop a comprehensive MP3 to ensure that communication among stakeholders is sufficient and that any requirements are enforceable for protection of managed pollinators. The need for outreach to these stakeholder groups will increase significantly as U.S. EPA moves forward with the new restrictions and requirements. The development of an MP3 requires open dialogue with stakeholders and the development could call for public hearings. U.S. EPA is proposing further pesticide label use restrictions and limitation to be enforced by state regulators. The primary purpose of a state MP3 is to reduce pesticide exposure to bees through timely communication and coordination among key stakeholders, including beekeepers, growers, pesticide applicators, and landowners.

Training sessions for the local CAC enforcement staff will need to include an investigative manual specifically for use in the State of California to respond to bee loss reports submitted by beekeepers and other stakeholders.

Outreach materials must be developed and disseminated, including making presentations on the topic, and creating pamphlets, brochures and leaflets on protecting managed bees from the effects of pesticide use. Increased plantings of crops dependent on managed pollinations, e.g., almonds, has significantly increased workload due to increasing number of pollinator pesticide damage incidents. Having pollinators available in the fields is necessary to maintain production levels (many fruits and vegetables rely on facilitated pollination), and this must be balanced with pesticide applications.

Although California adopted pollinator protection laws and regulations many years ago, the existing regulations are no longer adequate to address new pesticide chemistries and changes in agricultural practices and cropping systems, as well as federal, state, and worldwide expectations to protect the ever-declining pollinator populations. The new requirements proposed by U.S. EPA are more general, and will require revision of current rules to address California's needs. California's existing beekeeper/grower notification requirements include some voluntary actions, meaning that rulemaking will be needed to help prevent incidents from occurring.

If this workload is not addressed, DPR's ability to work cooperatively with U.S. EPA, Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency, and other agencies will becompromised. More importantly, DPR's statutory mission to regulate pesticides to provide for the proper, safe, and effective use of pesticides essential for the production of food and fiber and for the protection of the public and environmental health will not be met.

E. Outcomes and Accountability

Pesticide Registration

Once DPR hires and provides initial training to additional staff, DPR will augment its ongoing registration program activities including:

- Reduce the backlog of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients needing scientific evaluation of ecotoxicology data.
- Reduce the backlog of fish and wildlife adverse effects reports needing scientific evaluation.
- Evaluate pollinator ecotoxicology studies submitted to support the registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients and the continued registration of currently registered products.
- Establish new pollinator data requirements and protocol development where protocols do not currently exist, and communicate with pollinator affiliated experts from around the world.

- Conduct pollinator risk evaluations in accordance with the U.S. EPA's new risk assessment framework for new pesticide products containing new active ingredients and currently registered pesticide products, when appropriate.
- Evaluate and process amendments, required by U.S. EPA, to the labels of foliar use insecticides determined to be highly toxic to bees.
- Evaluate and process applications for registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients.

Pesticide Use Enforcement

Over the past year, the ENF Branch has shifted and leveraged its staff resources to organize and conduct field events, make presentations, and create outreach materials. With a Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist) assigned to these tasks, existing staff can resume their focus on human health and other environmental pesticide use enforcement activities.

DPR will develop the required California MP3 to protect bees while allowing for efficient agricultural production. The MP3 includes U.S. EPA monitoring of the success of these plans in reducing pesticide exposure to bees.

The Workload Measures and projected outcomes are listed on the chart and described as follows:

- Develop and conduct onsite collaborative educational field events with growers and beekeepers, which will result in timely effective communication between beekeepers and growers and in increased compliance with restrictions and protective measures.
- Develop the recently federally mandated state MP3, which will fulfill the federal requirement for an enforceable California state plan.
- Develop and conduct investigative enforcement training sessions for local CAC inspectors, resulting in consistent enforcement of the MP3, the regulations, and the new restrictions on pesticide label restrictions, resulting in fewer bee damage incidents.
- Make presentations to growers, applicators, beekeepers, regulators, and landowners, which will result in timely effective communication between beekeepers and growers and in increased compliance with restrictions and protective measures.
- Create and disseminate pamphlets, brochures, leaflets, and online information, which will result in increased education about measures to prevent pollinator damage.
- Identify pollinator bee/pesticide incidents and investigate cause, which results in fewer pesticide bee damage incidents.
- Develop rulemaking, which will align with President's directive on pollinator protection and include consideration of changed cropping patterns, new pesticide chemistries, and reduce recent increases in pollinator/pesticide incidents.

Projected Outcomes

Workload Measure	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
New active ingredient pesticide products received (previous 5 year average used for 2016-2020)	11 (As of June 30th)	43	43	43	43	43
New active ingredient pesticide products completed	7 (As of June 30th)	14	17	19	20	20
Backlog reduction of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients	35	30	20	10	0	0
Registered pesticide products requiring amended pollinator labeling language	0	3,000	2,500	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Conduct onsite field events for growers and beekeepers (events)	3	3	3	3	3	3
Develop managed pollinator protection plan (MP3)	Draft plan	Plan	Plan Implemented	0	0	0
Conduct enforcement training on pollinator protection (courses)	1	3	3	3	3	3
Make presentations to stakeholders on pollinator protection (presentations)	3	4	4	4	4	4
Create and disseminate pamphlets, brochures, etc. (documents)	1 Website	1	1	1	1	1
Develop rulemaking package to strengthen pollinator protection	0	Rulemaking concept	Rulemaking package	Rulemaking package	0	0

F. Analysis of All Feasible Alternatives

1. Do Nothing

Pro: This alternative would not require additional resources.

Con: This alternative would result in (1) continued delays in the evaluation of pollinator ecotoxicology studies submitted to support the registration of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients and the continued registration of currently registered products, (2) delays in establishing new pollinator data requirements and the development of study protocols, (3) the inability to keep up with emerging science through effective communication with pollinator experts, U.S EPA, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Health Canada's Pest Management Regulatory Agency, (4) the inability to process U.S. EPA's amendments to pollinator labeling language for highly toxic pesticide products in the required timeframe, (5) an increased backlog of new pesticide products containing new active ingredients requiring the evaluation of acute and chronic ecotoxicology studies, and (6) relying upon the Beekeeper Associations and the agricultural growers making changes to their current practices without regulatory oversight.

2. Appropriate $335,000 ($308,000 ongoing) and establish 2 permanent positions.

Pro: This alternative will increase DPR resources to address the workload associated with evaluating acute and chronic ecotoxicology studies, amending pollinator-labeling language for registered pesticide products, and the establishment of new pollinator data requirements and the development of the California MP3. This alternative will mitigate the effects of pesticides on the health and safety of pollinators, which are critical to California's and our Nation's economy, food security, and environmental health.

Con: This alternative would require additional ongoing resources from the DPR fund.

3. Redirect additional staff within existing resources.

Pro: This alternative would not require additional resources.

Con: Redirection of staff would require reductions in other statutory pesticide program activities. DPR is currently fulfilling its specifically mandated programs as efficiently as possible. Available resources fall short of those needed for mitigating data evaluation and enforcement. Redirection would require reductions in other critical programs for the protection of human health and the environment, putting DPR at risk of lawsuits and contempt of court for failing to meet mandated obligations. Finally, this alternative would not be feasible considering the severe reductions to DPR over the past decade.

4. **Obtain federal or other non-state resources.**

   Pro: This alternative would not require additional state resources.

   Con: It is unlikely that additional money is available

5. **Contract out the required work.**

   Pro: This alternative requires only additional contract funds and no additional positions.

   Con: DPR is solely responsible for promulgation of regulations regarding pesticide use and other activities that may bear a legal liability. While other agencies and external consultants have the expertise to conduct some of the mitigation research, none of them possesses the regulatory authority to implement the pesticide registration and enforcement regulatory programs.

6. **Amend laws to reduce the workload.**

   Pro: This alternative will decrease the workload depending on the laws that are amended. This alternative will also not require ongoing additional resources.

   Con: Changing and implementing laws and regulations that are less restrictive would put stakeholders and the environment at risk from the adverse effects of pesticides. If changes were made in regulations to reduce protections regarding the application of pesticides, applicators could apply pesticides in a way that is detrimental to human health and the environment.

G. Implementation Plan

Hiring Plan for Positions: To ensure the outcomes identified in this proposal are achieved, DPR will take the following steps to ensure that the requested positions are filled in a timely manner:

1. Request positions within existing state civil service classifications that are appropriate for the work to be performed.
2. DPR has an existing list of qualified applicants for the Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist) classification.
3. Begin recruitment efforts as early as possible, identifying the positions as pending legislative and administrative approvals.

H. Supplemental Information

Consulting funds are requested to develop and disseminate outreach materials in multiple languages; including making presentations on the topic, training, and creating pamphlets, brochures and leaflets on protecting managed bees from the effects of pesticide use.

I. Recommendation

DPR recommends alternative #2, to appropriate $335,000 ($308,000 ongoing) and establish two positions to address workload issues associated with the evaluation and reassessment of ecotoxicology studies and the establishment of new pollinator data requirements. By establishing the new positions, communication and collaboration with beekeepers, growers, and regulators will result in fewer pesticide bee damage incidents. This alternative will mitigate the effects of pesticides on the health of pollinators ensuring the safety of pollinators, the sustainability of our food production systems, avoid additional economic impact on the agricultural sector, and protect the health of the environment.

If the proposal is denied, these activities cannot occur, the state's MP3 will not be developed, and pollinator health may continue to decline.

BCP Fiscal Detail Sheet

BCP Title: Pollinator Protection Risk Evaluation

DP Name: 3930-004-BCP-DP-2016-GB

Budget Request Summary

	FY16					
	CY	BY	BY+1	BY+2	BY+3	BY+4
Positions - Permanent	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
Total Positions	**0.0**	**2.0**	**2.0**	**2.0**	**2.0**	**2.0**
Salaries and Wages						
Earnings - Permanent	0	146	146	146	146	146
Total Salaries and Wages	**$0**	**$146**	**$146**	**$146**	**$146**	**$146**
Total Staff Benefits	0	66	66	66	66	66
Total Personal Services	**$0**	**$212**	**$212**	**$212**	**$212**	**$212**
Operating Expenses and Equipment						
5301 - General Expense	0	4	4	4	4	4
5302 - Printing	0	3	3	3	3	3
5304 - Communications	0	4	4	4	4	4
5320 - Travel: In-State	0	4	4	4	4	4
5322 - Training	0	1	1	1	1	1
5324 - Facilities Operation	0	22	22	22	22	22
5340 - Consulting and Professional Services -	0	50	50	50	50	50
5346 - Information Technology	0	6	4	4	4	4
5368 - Non-Capital Asset Purchases - Equipment	0	25	0	0	0	0
539X - Other	0	4	4	4	4	4
Total Operating Expenses and Equipment	**$0**	**$123**	**$96**	**$96**	**$96**	**$96**
Total Budget Request	**$0**	**$335**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**

Fund Summary

Fund Source - State Operations						
0106 - Department of Pesticide Regulation Fund	0	335	308	308	308	308
Total State Operations Expenditures	**$0**	**$335**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**
Total All Funds	**$0**	**$335**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**

Program Summary

Program Funding						
3540010 - Pesticide Registration	0	68	68	68	68	68
3540019 - Human Health & Environmental	0	64	63	63	63	63
3540082 - Enforcement	0	203	177	177	177	177
Total All Programs	**$0**	**$335**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**	**$308**